

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 and 73-78 are pending in this application. Claims 73, 74 and 78 are withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1, 73 and 76 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 5-9 contain allowable subject matter. These claims are not rewritten in independent form, because it is believed that claim 1 from which they depend is allowable as discussed below.

II. Request For Interview

Applicants request a personal interview with Examiner Assaf, prior to issuance of the next Office communication, to discuss the merits of the application.

III. Improper Restriction

Claims 73, 74 and 78 are currently withdrawn from consideration for being directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed.

Specifically, the Office Action appears to state that the read on non-elected species 2.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Unelected species 2 is defined by the April 5, 2005 Election of Species Requirement as: "the holographic recording apparatus wherein recording the information comprises changing the recording angle while changing the angle formed between the signal light beam and the reference beam." Elected species 1 is defined as: "the holographic recording apparatus having the angle formed between the signal beam and the reference beam being set constant."

Applicant respectfully submit that nothing in claims 73, 74 or 78 would indicate that when recording information the devices "change the recording angle while changing the angle formed between the signal light beam and the reference beam."

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 73, 74 and 78 are consistent with the elected species. Accordingly, withdrawal of the election of species requirement regarding claims 73, 74 and 78 is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection Under 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 10-16 and 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0002895 to Kawano et al. ("Kawano"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a holographic recording method for **multiplexing at least two or more files**, each of the files comprising one or a plurality of page data, in an optical recording medium, as holograms, the method including, *inter alia*, "determining whether or not page data to be recorded constitute the same file; **recording page data of separate files respectively in different positions in the optical recording medium, with the page data of separate files not multiplexed**; and **performing recording control** with respect to page data of the same file **such that the page data of the same file can be multiplexed**" (emphasis added). Independent claim 76 recites similar features.

The Office Action acknowledges that Kawano does not teach that "page data of separate files are not multiplexed, and are recorded respectively in different positions in the optical recording medium," but asserts that "it would have been obvious, at the time the invention was made, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the hologram without multiplexing in order to reduce crosstalk (i.e., noise) during reconstruction of the holograms."

Applicants respectfully submit that even if the assertion made by the Office Action were true, Kawano still would not teach or suggest, "**recording page data of separate files respectively in different positions in the optical recording medium, with the page data of separate files not multiplexed**; and **performing recording control** with respect to page data of the same file **such that the page data of the same file can be multiplexed**," as recited in the claims. One advantage of the claimed invention is described in the specification at, for example, page 4, lines 15-19. Specifically, it becomes possible to selectively rewrite or erase desired stored file data without degrading other stored file data.


For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied art. Independent claims 73 and 76 include features similar to those addressed above with respect to claim 1 and are patentably distinguishable over the applied art for at least the same reasons addressed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 2-4, 10-16, 73-75 and 77-78 depend from independent claims 1, 73 and 76, respectively, and are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied art for at least their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 and 73-78 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:JMH

Date: April 14, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
